DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 820 CG 004 975

AUTHOR	Rickabaugh, Karl; And Others
TITLE	Relationship Between Counseling Outcome and Client Perceptions of Efficient Study Program Counselors: Two Analyses.
INSTITUTION	Utah Univ., Salt Lake City.
REPORT NO	RR-21
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	24p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Failure, Academic Performance, *Academic Probation, Counseling, *Counseling Effectiveness, *Counselor Attitudes, *Counselor Characteristics, Evaluation, *Perception, Personal Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Student Rehabilitation, Study Skills

ABSTRACT

The relationship between client perceptions and counselor effectiveness in a group setting was examined. An attempt was made to identify client-perceived counselor qualities which are related to outcome (change in grade point average) in a group counseling program designed to effect academic recovery with probationary students. The students, assigned to various treatment groups, consisted of 40 males and 27 females on academic probation. Six doctoral students served as the Efficient Study group leaders, and a counselor-structured, integrated didactic and experienced treatment approach was utilized. A slightly modified version of a semantic differential checklist developed by Fuhriman was used to measure client perceptions. Due to various analysis problems it was concluded that only the client perceived dimensions of counselor optimism and responsibility were significantly related to counseling outcome. The findings offer support for the proposal that the successful counselor is one who uses his "unique self" effectively, especially if his unique self is responsible and optimistic. (Author/RSM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036820

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELING OUTCOME AND CLIENT PERCEPTIONS OF EFFICIENT STUDY PROGRAM COUNSELORS: TWO ANALYSES

Karl Rickabaugh, Richard A. Heaps, and Addie Fuhriman

Research Report No. 21
University of Utah Counseling Center, 1969

CG004975

A/145/KR
12/69/24pgs.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELING OUTCOME AND CLIENT PERCEPTIONS OF EFFICIENT STUDY PROGRAM COUNSELORS: TWO ANALYSES

It is now generally accepted that there is "great variability in the quality of therapeutic effects..." (Bergin, 1966, p. 238). And, as Parker (1968) has pointed out, one of the reasons for this variability is that the behavior of the counselor seems to be a crucial variable in determining counseling outcome. This is supported by an increasing body of literature which indicates that some counselors or therapists are more effective than others (e.g., Betz, 1963; Dickenson & Truax, 1966; Truax & Carkhuff, 1964; Truax, Carkhuff, & Kodman, 1965; Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash & Stone, 1966). These studies have generally addressed themselves to the relationship between therapeutic effectiveness and differences in externally assessed therapist qualities. In addition, there are a number of studies which have demonstrated that counselors and therapists are differentially perceived by clients (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Gabbert, Ivey & Miller, 1967; Snelbecker, 1967; Strupp, Wallach, & Wogan, 1964; Truax, 1966). Most of these studies suggest that client perceptions, as a measure of counselor differences, may also be related to counselor effectiveness.

The aim of the present study was to examine the relationship between client perceptions and counselor effectiveness in a group setting. Accordingly, an attempt was made to identify client-perceived counselor qualities which are related to outcome (i.e., change in GPA) in a group counseling program designed to effect academic recovery with probationary students. It occurred to the writers that these objectives could be met by testing two alternate hypotheses:

a. High- and low-effective group counselors are perceived differently by their clients.

b. Group counselors who are perceived differently by their clients are differentially effective.

A question which might be asked here is whether the analyses suggested by the above hypotheses would necessarily yield comparable conclusions.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were students placed on academic probation who responded to a letter from the Scholastic Standards Committee suggesting that they utilize the services offered by the University of Utah Counseling Center. There were eight treatment groups comprised of 40 male and 27 female subjects. Their cumulative pre-treatment GPA's ranged from .54 to 1.99 with a mean of 1.54.[1]

Eighteen male and seven female probationary students were unable to participate in the Efficient Study Program because of scheduling conflicts, etc. These students comprised the control group. Their cumulative pre-treatment GPA's ranged from .92 to 1.96 with a mean of 1.45.

Treatment Procedure

Subjects were assigned to treatment groups in a quasi-random manner based upon the students' schedules and the times they were free to attend. Each group, ranging from six to twelve members, met twice weekly over a period of seven weeks with each session lasting approximately one hour. The median number of client contacts for the eight groups combined was 11 hours.

Six doctoral students employed as counseling psychology interns at the University of Utah Counseling Center served as the Efficient Study group leaders.

A counselor-structured, integrated didactic and experiental treatment approach was utilized. The program was designed to deal with issues of educational-vocational involvement, study method, and personal-social adjustment. The material

---

[1]Letter grades at the University of Utah correspond to the following quantitative grade-point equavalents: A=4.00, B=3.00, C+=2.40, C=2.00, C-=1.60, D=1.00, E=0.00.

presented and the topics introduced for discussion were based upon a priori diagnostic assumptions and conclusions (Rickabaugh, 1969; Rickabaugh & Pappas, 1969). An outline of major topic areas can be found in Appendix A. The program's primary objective was to help students achieve scholastic success.

Counseling Outcome

A pre-post change score obtained by taking the difference per subject between his pre-treatment cumulative GPA and his GPA earned during the quarter post-treatment was used to assess the effect of the treatment experience. Pre-treatment cumulative GPA (vs. previous quarter's GPA) was used to provide the most rigorous and representative measure of each student's level of functioning prior to placement in a treatment or control group.

Client Perceptions

A slightly modified version of a semantic differential checklist developed by Fuhriman (1969) was used to measure client perceptions. The semantic differential contained 26 pairs of bi-polar adjectives selected to represent role-relevant counselor characteristics. Each pair of adjectives was separated by seven spaces (see Appendix B). Following completion of the treatment program the semantic differential, accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix C), was mailed to each subject. The letter asked the subject to complete the checklist, indicating how he felt about his counselor as an Efficient Study group leader. An 80 per cent return was obtained, ensuring a representative sample.

Analyses

Analysis I. Using pre- and post-treatment GPA's, the six counselors were divided into high- and low-outcome groups. Client perceptions of these two groups on each of the semantic differential scales were contrasted by means of *t* tests.

Analysis II. Using client perceptions, the six counselors were divided into high- and low-rating groups on each of the semantic differential scales. GPA (i.e., outcome) differences between each of these groups were contrasted by means of *t* tests.

RESULTS

Analysis I.

Mean client ratings on the 26 semantic differential scales for each of the six group counselors are presented in Table 1.

An initial outcome comparison between the clients of all six counselors (total treatment) and the control subjects yielded a significant difference in favor of the treatment groups ($t=2.87$, $p<.01$).[2] The six counselors were then divided into two groups on the basis of client outcome. The three counselors (C, E, F) with the largest mean difference between clients' pre- and post-treatment GPA's (.57) comprised one group; the three counselors (A, B, D) with the smallest mean difference between clients' pre- and post-treatment GPA's (.18) comprised the second group. The differences between the high-effective and low-effective counseling groups was found to be significant ($t=2.52$, $p<.02$).

Table 2 presents comparisons between the mean semantic differential ratings for the high- and low-effective counseling groups. Differences between the two counseling groups were found to be significant on 18 of the 26 semantic differential scales. These data support the hypothesis that high- and low-effective group counselors are perceived differently by their clients.

---

[2]See Appendix D for control group comparisons.

TABLE 1

Mean Scores on Twenty-six Semantic Differential Scales
For Six Efficient Study Group Counselors

Scale	Counselor A (N=6)	B (N=8)	C (N=9)	D (N=9)	E (N=7)	F (N=28)	Scale Mean
flexible-rigid	6.33	6.50	5.67	3.11	6.43	6.04	5.72
active-passive	5.33	6.25	6.22	5.00	6.43	6.36	6.06
honest-dishonest	6.33	7.00	6.44	5.78	7.00	6.71	6.58
open-closed	5.83	6.38	6.44	4.56	6.86	6.18	6.06
attentive-inattentive	6.17	6.88	6.67	5.89	6.71	6.57	6.51
responsible-irresponsible	6.33	6.75	6.78	5.00	6.86	6.79	6.51
creative-uncreative	3.83	5.88	5.22	3.22	5.86	5.79	5.21
optimistic-pessimistic	5.67	5.88	6.00	4.44	6.57	6.26	5.93
appreciative-unappreciative	6.00	6.38	6.56	3.56	6.86	6.04	5.90
responsive-unresponsive	6.17	6.88	6.44	5.56	6.71	6.54	6.42
cooperative-competitive	5.50	6.63	5.78	3.34	6.86	5.86	5.67
perceptive-unperceptive	6.17	6.00	6.00	4.11	6.57	6.14	5.88
patient-impatient	6.33	6.75	6.56	3.45	6.86	6.69	6.22
tolerant-intolerant	6.50	6.63	6.44	3.22	6.86	6.46	6.09
accessible-inaccessible	5.83	6.13	6.00	4.00	6.26	6.29	5.88
communicative-uncommunicative	6.17	6.63	6.44	5.56	7.00	6.50	6.40
sensitive-insensitive	5.67	5.88	5.67	4.11	6.57	5.43	5.48
accepting-unaccepting	5.83	6.25	6.00	3.78	6.43	6.11	5.66
confrontive-nonconfrontive	6.17	5.63	5.33	4.56	4.86	5.69	5.43
warm-cold	6.17	6.38	6.33	3.56	7.00	6.29	6.00
friendly-unfriendly	6.50	6.38	6.44	5.11	7.00	6.54	6.36
dominant-meek	3.83	4.38	4.11	5.33	4.00	4.82	4.57
pleasant-unpleasant	5.83	6.88	6.33	3.56	6.71	6.68	6.16
likeable-not likeable	6.33	6.88	6.44	3.78	6.71	6.75	6.28
understandable-confusing	6.33	6.88	6.44	4.67	6.86	6.50	6.31
talkative-quiet	5.50	5.25	5.11	4.89	6.00	5.79	5.51
Total Mean	5.87	6.32	6.07	4.35	6.49	6.22	5.95

NOTE.--Client responses to the 26 pairs of adjectives were given scores from one to seven with ratings nearer the adjectives on the left margin receiving the higher scores. The above means were based on perceptions of a probationary student sample. Inclusion of ratings by non-probationary students involved in the Efficient Study Program might change some mean ratings.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values Comparing Two Counseling Groups on Twenty-six Semantic Differential Scales

Scale	High Effective[a] $\bar{X}$	High Effective[a] SD	Low Effective[b] $\bar{X}$	Low Effective[b] SD	Mean Difference	t
flexible-rigid	6.02	.92	5.13	1.87	.89	2.57*
active-passive	6.34	.85	5.52	1.38	.82	2.96**
honest-dishonest	6.70	.64	6.35	1.00	.35	1.71
open-closed	6.34	.88	5.52	1.66	.82	2.60*
attentive-inattentive	6.61	.61	6.30	.96	.31	1.59
responsible-irresponsible	6.80	.46	5.96	1.16	.84	4.16***
creative-uncreative	5.68	.99	4.30	1.90	1.38	3.85***
optimistic-pessimistic	6.27	.81	5.26	1.39	1.01	3.70***
appreciative-unappreciative	6.27	.84	5.17	1.95	1.10	3.17**
responsive-unresponsive	6.55	.69	6.17	1.09	.38	1.72
cooperative-competitive	6.00	.96	5.04	1.97	.96	2.64*
perceptive-unperceptive	6.18	.77	5.30	1.63	.88	2.96**
patient-impatient	6.68	.51	5.35	2.18	1.33	3.79***
tolerant-intolerant	6.52	.66	5.26	2.12	1.26	3.57***
accessible-inaccessible	6.23	1.02	5.22	1.67	1.01	3.02**
communicative-uncommunicative	6.57	.72	6.09	1.67	.48	1.61
sensitive-insensitive	5.66	1.11	5.13	1.65	.53	1.54
accepting-unaccepting	6.14	.84	5.17	1.79	.97	2.98**
confrontive-nonconfrontive	5.48	1.41	5.35	1.44	.13	.35
warm-cold	6.41	.78	5.22	1.89	1.19	3.58***
friendly-unfriendly	6.59	.72	5.91	1.18	.68	2.90**
dominant-meek	4.55	1.01	4.61	1.44	-.06	.20
pleasant-unpleasant	6.61	.53	5.30	1.88	1.31	4.20***
likeable-not likeable	6.68	.55	5.52	2.10	1.16	3.39**
understandable-confusing	6.55	.72	5.87	1.65	.68	2.30*
talkative-quiet	5.68	1.27	5.17	1.27	.51	1.53

[a]Forty-four clients rated counselors C,E, and F.
[b]Twenty-three clients rated counselors A,B, and D.
* $p < .05$ (two tailed -- no predicted direction).
** $p < .01$ (two tailed -- no predicted direction).
*** $p < .001$ (two tailed -- no predicted direction).

Analysis II.

Table 3 presents mean client ratings of counselors ranked high and low on each of the 26 semantic differential scales. All 26 divisions between the three counselors with the highest client ratings and the three counselors with the lowest client ratings for each scale were found to be significant. Seven high-low counselor combinations resulted: counselors BEF vs. ACD, BCE vs. ADF, AEF vs. BCD, CEF vs. ABD, ABE vs. CDF, ABF vs. CDE, and BDF vs. ACE (see Table 3).[3]

Only one of the seven outcome comparisons presented in Table 4, counselors CEF vs. ABD, was found to be significant. The semantic differential scales associated with this counselor combination were optimistic-pessimistic and responsible-irresponsible (Table 3). Therefore, only the combination of counselors who were perceived differently by their clients on the optimism and responsibility dimensions was found to be differentially effective.

DISCUSSION

Although the first analysis indicated that 18 of the 26 semantic differential dimensions were related to counseling outcome, an examination of the scale means for the six counselors revealed that such a conclusion is not warranted (see Table 1). Client perceptions dichotomized on the basis of high and low outcome tended to obscure individual counselor data which were clearly not consistent with the statistical findings (e.g., low outcome counselor B was frequently rated relatively higher than high outcome counselor C). The fact that significance was repeatedly obtained appears, in the case of most scales, to be largely a function

---

[3]Six counselors taken three at a time would produce 20 groups of three counselors, or 10 pairs of three-counselor groups (10 high-low combinations).

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values Comparing Client Ratings of Counselors Ranked High and Low on Twenty-Six Semantic Differential Scales

	High Rating				Low Rating					
Scale[a]	Counselor Groupings	N[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD	Counselor Groupings	N[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD	Difference	t
active-passive	B,E,F	43	6.35	.86	A,C,D	24	5.54	1.35	.81	2.95**
honest-dishonest	B,E,F	43	6.81	.49	A,C,D	24	6.17	.94	.64	3.59***
creative-uncreative	B,E,F	43	5.81	.97	A,C,D	24	4.13	1.72	1.68	5.06***
responsive-unresponsive	B,E,F	43	6.63	.65	A,C,D	24	6.04	1.06	.59	2.79**
cooperative-competitive	B,E,F	43	6.16	.94	A,C,D	24	4.79	1.80	1.37	4.03***
patient-impatient	B,E,F	43	6.72	.50	A,C,D	24	5.33	2.11	1.39	4.05***
accessible-inaccessible	B,E,F	43	6.35	.92	A,C,D	24	5.21	1.73	1.14	3.46***
communicative-uncommunicative	B,E,F	43	6.60	.69	A,C,D	24	6.04	1.64	.56	1.92*
accepting-unaccepting	B,E,F	43	6.19	.84	A,C,D	24	5.13	1.72	1.06	3.34***
pleasant-unpleasant	B,E,F	43	6.72	.45	A,C,D	24	5.17	1.89	1.55	5.06***
likeable-not likeable	B,E,F	43	6.77	.47	A,C,D	24	5.42	2.02	1.35	4.12***
understandable-confusing	B,E,F	43	6.63	.68	A,C,D	24	5.75	1.55	.88	3.17**
open-closed	B,C,E	24	6.54	.71	A,D,F	43	5.79	1.42	.75	2.38*
attentive-inattentive	B,C,E	24	6.75	.46	A,D,F	43	6.37	.84	.38	2.03*
appreciative-unappreciative	B,C,E	24	6.58	.76	A,D,F	43	5.51	1.56	1.07	3.11**
sensitive-insensitive	B,C,E	24	6.00	1.15	A,D,F	43	5.19	1.35	.81	2.44*
warm-cold	B,C,E	24	6.54	.64	A,D,F	43	5.70	1.59	.84	2.44*
perceptive-unperceptive	A,E,F	41	6.22	.72	B,C,D	26	5.35	1.62	.87	2.96**
friendly-unfriendly	A,E,F	41	6.61	.73	B,C,D	26	5.96	1.40	.65	2.45*
talkative-quiet	A,E,F	41	5.78	1.20	B,C,D	26	5.08	1.33	.70	2.20*
responsible-irresponsible	C,E,F	44	6.80	.46	A,B,D	23	5.96	1.16	.84	4.16***
optimistic-pessimistic	C,E,F	44	6.27	.81	A,B,D	23	5.26	1.39	1.01	3.70***
flexible-rigid	A,B,E	21	6.43	.49	C,D,F	46	5.39	1.54	1.04	2.98**
tolerant-intolerant	A,B,E	21	6.66	.64	C,D,F	46	5.83	1.71	.83	2.12*
confrontive-nonconfrontive	A,B,F	42	5.74	1.31	C,D,E	25	4.92	1.49	.82	2.31*
dominant-meek	B,D,F	45	4.84	1.19	A,C,E	22	4.00	.90	.84	2.88**

[a]For this table the semantic differential scales were ordered to match the counselor groupings.
[b]N refers to the number of clients in each counselor grouping.
*p < .05 (one tailed).
**p < .01 (one tailed).
***p < .001 (one tailed).

TABLE 4

t Tests on Outcome Between Counselors Rated High and Low On Twenty-Six Semantic Differential Scales[a]

Counselor Groupings	N[b]	Mean[c] GPA Pre	Mean[d] GPA Post	Mean Pre-Post Change	Difference	t
High (B,E,F)	43	1.57	2.06	.49	.13	.76
vs. Low (A,C,D)	24	1.49	1.85	.36		
High (B,C,E)	24	1.64	2.16	.52	.12	.70
vs. Low (A,D,F)	43	1.48	1.88	.40		
High (C,E,F)	44	1.57	2.14	.57	.39	2.52*
vs. Low (A,B,D)	23	1.50	1.68	.18		
High (A,B,E)	21	1.60	1.84	.24	.29	1.68
vs. Low (C,D,F)	46	1.52	2.05	.53		
High (A,E,F)	41	1.54	1.98	.44	.01	.06
vs. Low (B,C,D)	26	1.54	1.99	.45		
High (A,B,F)	42	1.53	1.91	.38	.17	1.01
vs. Low (C,D,E)	25	1.56	2.11	.55		
High (B,D,F)	45	1.51	1.96	.45	.02	.11
vs. Low (A,C,E)	22	1.59	2.02	.43		

[a]Seven comparisons resulted from separating counselors into high and low rating groups. Counselor groupings for each scale are reported in Table 3.

[b]N refers to the number of clients in each counselor grouping.

[c]Computed using cumulative grade-point averages.

[d]Computed using grades earned the quarter of treatment.

*p < .02 (two tailed -- no predicted direction).

of the markedly deviant client perceptions of a single low outcome counselor (counselor D). This problem did not occur with the second analysis where the statistical findings are consistent with the individual data.

It appears that analyses using a small number of counselors may produce specious results if comparisons are made on variables containing markedly deviant intra-group observations and/or overlapping inter-group observations for the variable being statistically contrasted. The present study suggests that findings reported on the basis of such analyses should be considered suspect unless individual means for the variables being investigated are reported.

Taking into consideration these analysis problems, the writers concluded that only the client-perceived dimensions of counselor optimism and responsibility were significantly related to counseling outcome in the present study. It was also apparent that the six counselors were differentially effective, and that all of the counselor qualities investigated in this study revealed differences between counselors (see Table 3). These findings suggest that effective counselors can be perceived very differently.

The above ideas offer some support for the Combs and Soper (1963) proposal that the successful counselor is the one who uses his "unique self" effectively, especially if his unique self is responsible and optimistic. Their research suggested that effective counselors, while exhibiting different behaviors, tend to share a common perceptual orientation. For example, Combs and Soper (1963) found that good counselors perceive their clients as being able rather than unable, themselves as being capable rather than lacking, and their purpose as being facilitating and altruistic rather than manipulating and narcissistic. It seems likely that such counselors would be perceived as being optimistic and responsible by their clients. This is certainly consistent with the findings of the present study.

Bare (1967) and Finley (1969) have suggested that one reason counselors with these qualities are successful is that their behaviors complement the need-structures of many of their clients, and consequently they serve as effectual growth models. Finley's (1969) reasoning was inspired by several years of therapeutic experience. Bare (1967) based her explanation on empirical data. She found, for example, that counselors judged to be effective differed from their clients on such dimensions as enthusiasm and responsibility. Underachievers have repeatedly been shown to be characterized, as a group, by dependence, low self-esteem, low concern for others, and low sense of responsibility (Taylor, 1964; Wellington & Wellington, 1965). Likewise, it was apparent in the present investigation that clients, in contrast to effective counselors, could be characterized as pessimistic with respect to themselves and their future with limited concern for the needs of others. It would appear that this kind of client may need a counselor who is optimistic and responsible if he is to realize change in a desirable direction. Thus, this study supports, both empirically and anecdotally, the observations of Finley (1969) and Bare (1967).

In addition, the high-effective counselors appeard to differ from the low-effective counselors in that they were more enthusiastic and involved with the treatment program than the low effective counselors. That is, they appeared more optimistic about the treatment approach and their relevant counseling skills. For example, all three low-effective counselors expressed some initial ambivalence about their ability to function effectively as Efficient Study Program counselors; whereas, the high-effective counselors expressed initial confidence in the program and their ability as counselors.

An experience of one of the high-effective counselors helped the writers to identify counselor attitudes and behaviors which the clients' may have perceived

as responsible. Independent of the rating scale findings this counselor was described by his counseling group as possessing "a sense of responsibility." These clients expressed the feeling that their counselor felt his involvement with them in the treatment program would have an impact on their lives and that he was committed to a complete investment of himself with them during their experience in the group. They interpreted this to mean that their counselor felt a genuine concern for them and their future well-being.

Parker (1968) proposed that counselor effectiveness may be largely a function of "the client's expectancy of being helped...and the counselor's own belief in his ability to help" (p. 12). It seems reasonable that a counselor who believes in his own ability to help is likely to be perceived by clients as being optimistic, and that a counselor who conveys optimism and responsibility is likely to affect the clients' expectancy of being helped. The results of this investigation suggest that the client-perceived counselor qualities of optimism and responsibility should be considered as necessary but not sufficient indicators of a counselor's ability to create the conditions necessary for client change, particularly in a treatment program designed to effect academic recovery.

REFERENCES

Bare, C.E. Relationship of counselor personality and counselor-client personality similarity to selected success criteria. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 419-425.

Barrett-Lennard, G.T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76 (43), (Whole No. 562).

Bergin, A.E. Some implications of psychotherapy research for therapeutic practice. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 235-246.

Betz, B.J. Differential success rates of psychotherapists with "process" and "non-process" schizophrenic patients. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 1963, 119, 1090-1091.

Combs, A.W., and Soper, D.W. The perceptual organization of effective counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 222-226.

Dickenson, W.A., and Truax, C.B. Group counseling with college underachievers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 243-247.

Finley, R.E. Personal communication. Counseling Center, University of Utah, November 21, 1969.

Fuhriman, A.J. The relation of client susceptibility to persuasion and counselor expectation on the outcomes of a counseling experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

Gabbert, K.H., Ivey, A.E., and Miller, C.D. Counselor assignment and client attitude. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 131-136.

Parker, C.A. Counseling theories and counselor education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Rickabaugh, K.R. Effecting academic recovery: An efficient study program pilot study. Research Report No. 19. University of Utah Counseling Center, 1969. (Mimeo.)

Rickabaugh, K.R., and Pappas, J.P. The academic recovery of probationary students: An exploratory study. Utah Personnel and Guidance Department Research Bulletin, 1969, 2, 25-29.

Snelbecker, G.E. Influence of therapeutic techniques on college students' perceptions of therapists. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 614-618.

Strupp, H.H., Wallach, M.S., and Wogan, M. Psychotherapy experience in retrospect: Questionnaire survey of former patients and their therapists. Psychological Monographs, 1964, 78 (11), (Whole No. 588).

Taylor, R.C. Personality traits and discrepant achievement: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 76-82.

Truax, C.B. Therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and patient personality change in group psychotherapy: A comparison between interaction unit measures, time sample measures, patient perception measures. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 225-229.

Truax, C.B., and Carkhuff, R.R. For better or for worse: The process of psychotherapeutic change. In Recent advances in behavioral change. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964.

Truax, C.B., Carkhuff, R.R., and Kodman, F. Relationships between therapist-offered conditions and patient change in group psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1965, 21, 327-329.

Truax, C.B., Wargo, D.G., Frank, J.D., Imber, S.D., Battle, C.C., Hoehn-Saric, R., Nash, E.H., and Stone, A.R. Therapist empathy, genuineness, and warmth and patient therapeutic outcome. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 395-401.

Wellington, C.B., and Wellington, J. The underachiever: Challenges and guidelines. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

APPENDIX A

Counseling Center
EFFICIENT STUDY PROGRAM

GROUP EXPERIENCE OUTLINE

I. EDUCATIONAL-VOCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

- A. SELF-ASSESSMENT
- B. SELF-CONFIDENCE
- C. CONCEPT OF WORK/SCHOOL
- D. TIME SCHEDULING
- E. SCHOLASTIC MOTIVATION
- F. EDUCATIONAL-VOCATIONAL GOALS

II. PERSONAL-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

- A. ATTITUDES AND VALUES
- B. SELF-CONCEPT
- C. SOCIALIZATION, MATURITY, and RESPONSIBILITY
- D. OTHER PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTMENT

III. STUDY HABITS AND SKILLS

- A. RETENTION AND FORGETTING
- B. TEXTBOOK READING AND STUDY
- C. EXAMINATIONS
- D. LISTENING AND NOTETAKING
- E. LIBRARY USAGE AND TERM PAPERS

APPENDIX B

Instructions

We would like to find out how you personally feel about your group counselor by having you rate him on some scales. Simply place an X between each set of adjectives at the point you feel best describes your counselor.

Here is how to use these scales:

If one of the two words says exactly how you feel about your counselor, place a check mark in either one of these 2 ways:

weak :X:__:__:__:__:__:__: strong <u>OR</u> weak :__:__:__:__:__:__:X: strong

If one of the two words almost says how you feel about your counselor, place a mark in either one of these 2 ways:

large :__:X:__:__:__:__:__: small <u>OR</u> large :__:__:__:__:__:X:__: small

If one of the two words just barely says how you feel about your counselor, place your mark in either one of these 2 ways:

weak :__:__:X:__:__:__:__: strong <u>OR</u> weak :__:__:__:__:X:__:__: strong

If the two words equally say how you feel about your counselor or if you are undecided, place a check mark in the center space on the scale like this:

large :__:__:__:X:__:__:__: small

Do not spend more than a few seconds on each scale; just give your first impression. Do not leave any scales blank, and place only one mark on any one scale. There are no right or wrong answers, we just want to know how you feel.

A/31/KR,RH
5/69/2pp.

Please rate _____ as you personally feel about him/her as an Efficient Study group counselor.

flexible :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: rigid

passive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: active

honest :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: dishonest

closed :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: open

inattentive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: attentive

responsible :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: irresponsible

uncreative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: creative

pessimistic :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: optimistic

appreciative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: unappreciative

responsive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: unresponsive

competitive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: cooperative

perceptive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: unperceptive

impatient :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: patient

tolerant :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: intolerant

inaccessible :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: accessible

communicative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: uncommunicative

sensitive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: insensitive

unaccepting :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: accepting

confrontive :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: ncnccnfrcntive

warm :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: cold

friendly :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: unfriendly

dominant :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: meek

unpleasant :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: pleasant

likeable :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: not likeable

understandable :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: confusing

talkative :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: quiet

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Salt Lake City, 84112

Counseling Center
2120 Annex Building

Dear _____:

We realize it's late, but the Counseling Center would like to get some of your attitudes about the Efficient Study Program. In particular we are interested in some of your own personal feelings about your counselor.

We need your help to evaluate the program, so it is important that you be as honest as possible in your rating. Your counselor will not see the results.

Please fill out the attached rating form which will take only a few minutes. We have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope to facilitate a prompt return.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Addie Fuhriman
Counseling Psychologist
University of Utah Counseling Center

AF:rs

A/29/AJF
5/69/1pg.

APPENDIX D

t Tests on Outcome Between Total Treatment, Counselor Groupings and a Control Group

Groups[a]	N[b]	Mean[c] GPA Pre	Mean[d] GPA Post	Mean Pre-Post Change	Difference	t
Total Treatment	67	1.54	1.98	.44	.48	2.87**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
B,E,F	43	1.57	2.06	.49	.53	2.94**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,C,D	24	1.49	1.85	.36	.40	1.84*
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
B,C,E	24	1.64	2.16	.52	.56	2.77**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,D,F	43	1.48	1.88	.40	.44	2.32*
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
C,E,F	44	1.57	2.14	.57	.61	3.47***
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,B,D	23	1.50	1.68	.18	.22	1.23
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,B,E	21	1.60	1.84	.24	.28	1.25
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
C,D,F	46	1.52	2.05	.53	.57	3.23**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,E,F	41	1.54	1.98	.44	.48	2.41**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
B,C,D	26	1.54	1.99	.45	.49	2.63**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,B,F	42	1.53	1.91	.38	.42	2.17*
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
C,D,E	25	1.56	2.11	.55	.59	3.03**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
B,D,F	45	1.51	1.96	.45	.49	2.87**
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		
A,C,E	22	1.59	2.02	.43	.47	1.99*
vs. Control	25	1.45	1.41	-.04		

[a]Fourteen different three-counselor groups resulted from separating six counselors into high and low groups using semantic differential ratings.
[b]N refers to the number of clients in each group.
[c]Computed using cumulative grade-point averages.
[d]Computed using grades earned the quarter of treatment.
* $p < .05$ (one tailed).
** $p < .01$ (one tailed).
*** $p < .001$ (one tailed).